

Date: Thu, 19 May 94 04:30:14 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #212
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 19 May 94 Volume 94 : Issue 212

Today's Topics:

 Code test speeds (2 msgs)
Income Opportunities from Investment Banker - Interested?
 Theory Exams.
What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 18 May 94 13:25:48 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Do you mean that the test session for the code contains a story that people
>listen at, and then they answer questions based on what they heard? If that's

that's exactly correct.

the test is provided on tapes from the exam coordinator (i have something like
4 different versions, i think, with another 4 due out soon) and can also be
done by hand or computer if need be. but i like tapes because you feed the
boom box into the IR headphone distribution system and everyone listens to
code on an IR headset. This is the only way to fly (if the other choice is a
cassette tape player blaring code into a room with smooth walls...)

the test starts with 6 Vs sent in two groups of 3 and end with the procedural
signal for end of message (people get this wrong but it's a "free" character,

you know - the V's don't count...)

You get 5-7 minutes of code that includes all the letters, numbers, punctuation (SP?) and prosigns required for the test.

an example 5 WPM test might look like:

VVV VVV

KQ4XU/6 DE AD2CZ/7 (note how the calls usually have the "hard to use" letters and a bunch of numbers...)

FB HANK UR RST 589 IN TROMBONE TROMBONE, FL.

I HAVE BEEN A HAM FOR 13 YEARS AND HAVE WORKED AS A

PEEN COUNTER IN A HAMMER FACTORY FOR 20 MONTHS bt

I PLAY THE XYLOPHONE IN THE COMPANY BAND AND AM FIRST CHAIR bt

I AM USING A SONY T4XB AND A DRAKE ICF2001 WITH 50 WATTS.

MY ANT IS A WINDOM DIPOLE WITH YAGI FEED (not like they'd do something so weird like this in a real test)

SO HW COPY? BT

KQ4XU/6 DE AD2CZ/7 sk ar

- 1) what was the receiving station's callsign?
kq4zu/1 kq4pg/7 kq4xu/6 kq4xd/6
- 2) what was the sending station's callsign?
ad2cj/7 ad2cz/7 nd2qz/7 ag2cz/7
- 3) what was the receiving station's signal report?
589 579 521 581
- 4) what was the receiving station's name?
henry jake jack hank
- 5) what does the sending station do for a living?
bean counter peen counter accountant carpenter
- 6) how long has the sending station worked at his job?
20 years 20 months 10 years 10 months
- 7) what type of antenna is the sending station using?
yagi dipole windom quad
- 8) what position does the sending station hold in the band?
lead singer first chair first trombone conductor
- 9) what type of receiver is the sending station using?
drake sony sanyo collins
- 10) how long has the sending station been an amateur radio operator?
13 years 31 years 13 months 31 months

Until recently, tests from ARRL/VEC would have been fill in the blank, but changed to multiple choice (part of what's supposed to be a standardization between different VECs).

You get your test and you mark up your answers and we grade for 7 of 10 and for 1 minute of solid copy - you have 2 ways to pass.

73, bill wb9ivr

Date: Wed, 18 May 1994 13:17:14 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2r0ds7\$pbh@chnews.intel.com>,
cmoore@ilx018.intel.com (Cecil A. Moore -FT-~) writes:

|> The guy I know with Attention Deficit Disorder has been a ham for
|> 30 years and holds a commercial FCC license. He has forgotten more
|> about radio than I will ever know. He is barred from normal HF
|> operation even though he was an AM broadcast engineer for many years.
|> He has spent hundreds of hours trying to learn to copy code. Ever try
|> to get a code waiver for ADD?

Its been my experience that doctors will sign just about anything, and up to about a year ago, the FCC let almost every waiver fly. And, although they were supposed to have "cracked down" on code waivers, I still fail to see why anyone with a legitimate, documentable medical history which prevents them from copying code cannot get a waiver with minimal effort.

|> I have an Advanced ticket only because they allow me to write down
|> characters during the code test. If the code test required me to copy
|> code in my head without writing it down, I would be forced to settle
|> for a no-code license. Don't you know that "real Hams" can copy code
|> in their heads? Don't you think that should be a requirement also?

At higher speeds one must copy in their head, which is probably why I'm not an Extra as my short-term memory is terrible. Long term memory is fine, even short-term with repetition (for instance, I was recently able to memorize the GROL Elements 1 and 3 question pools in a week by repetitively reading the pools and drilling myself on the computer.) Some people have indicated that my problem may not be short-term memory at all, but rather "buffering" on my part.

In time, I'll probably outgrow this problem. Ten years ago when I first got started in ham radio I couldn't copy 5 wpm at all. You could send me a .- or a -. and it sounded the same to me. But, I think this was because I convinced myself that it was "too hard". When I finally went back to get licensed 2 1/2 years ago, I was convinced I was going to pass the code, and I did. Its all mental attitude. Even now, I think that half the problem I have with the 20wpm is mental - I've convinced myself that its "too hard", and thus even when I do try, in the back of my mind I'm not really.

In the interim, however, you don't see me whining about HF access;
about how the 20wpm is "too hard" and should be eliminated.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- RI Center For Political Incorrectness & Environment Ignorance
-- 'Have you hugged your chainsaw today?'

Date: 19 May 94 05:41:27 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Income Opportunities from Investment Banker - Interested?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have never requested any information from you nor are you among my list
of associates.

If you contact me again I will have my attorney call your attorney
concerning legal action against you.

Sincerely,
Roger M Kolaks

On Wed, 18 May 1994 TAFORD@delphi.com wrote:

>
>
> Please send inquiries/replies to: taford@delphi.com
>
>

Date: Tue, 17 May 1994 12:45:54 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-
state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!ftpbox!mothost!lmpsbbs!NewsWatcher!
user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Theory Exams.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <54+P1s3.ndfriedman@delphi.com>, Neil D. Friedman
<ndfriedman@delphi.com> wrote:

> Brad Killebrew N5LJV <st3qi@elroy.uh.edu> writes:
>

> >I think we should go back to that. I have read several people in this
> >group saying that ham radio operators are getting dumber -- I believe it.
>
> Ham exams have always been at the level where a motivated high school
> student can, with reasonable attention, obtain most (if not all) operating
> privileges. That's where they were in the 20's, the 60's, and that's
> where they are today.
>
> ..Neil, N3DF

It's just so much harder TO motivate today's high school student to develop a serious interest in amateur radio. If anything, it should be easier today with all the emphasis on technology, but the world's purpose for doing things has changed in the last two decades. If you value the yuppie opinion, now you have to work your tail off just to be "relaxed." An old friend who has heard it all over his 96 years often reminds me, "Just because it's new doesn't make it better!"

--
Karl Beckman, P.E. < Genius may have its limitations, but >
Motorola LMPS- Analog Data < stupidity is not thus handicapped. >
< - Elbert Hubbard >
The statements and opinions expressed here are not those of Motorola Inc.
Amateur radio WA8NVW @ K8MR.NEOH.USA.NA NavyMARS VBH @ NOGBN.NOASI

Date: 18 May 94 20:46:13 GMT
From: agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!news.hal.COM!olivea!korie!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!
engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!engnews2!rfm@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <SR0.94May17235139@media-lab.media.mit.edu> sro@media.mit.edu (Shawn O'Donnell) writes:

>I wish they[code requirement supporters]d consider what the code obsession
>does for our image on M Street. Honestly, have you ever heard someone from
>the FCC talk about what they think about the importance of the code?

Well, here's a quote from the most recent ARRL letter:

FCC TURNS DOWN PETITIONS
FOR CHANGING AMATEUR RULES

In late April the FCC denied three petitions from

amateurs to change the licensing structure. One petitioner would have lowered Morse code requirements and two others would have eliminated the 5 wpm CW examination for the Novice license. The FCC said that the current amateur license requirements were the result of Commission proceedings that produced thousands of comments. "The amateur community indicated on each occasion that it strongly desires to preserve communications by telegraphy," the FCC said.

Similar language about "the amateur community ... desires to preserve ... telegraphy" appears on the back of the latest Form 610.

I tried to find the actual order on <ftp.fcc.gov>, but I couldn't. I did find a reference to it in a Daily Digest, it's DA 97-387, issued April 20.

I may be reading too much into this, but it appears to me that the FCC thinks that the no-code tech is enough change for now, and they see no reason to go beyond what they see as the opinion of a majority of hams. They're not unaffected by politics -- why should they stir up trouble.

Even though I believe the current licensing structure overemphasizes code proficiency, I also find the argument that the no-code Tech is doing its job so no further changes are needed right now has some merit.

I do think the emphasis on code is bad, but no longer fatal. As I've talked to people (bright, energetic people who'd be contributors) about ham radio, I find they lose a lot of interest when they find out they're still walled off from a lot of the hobby unless they learn the code. But I think that enough people are being brought in by the no-code Tech that the downward trend has been reversed; in a few years, enough active hams will have been no-coders that it should be possible to convince the FCC that amateurs in the main no longer value the preservation of telegraphy so highly.

The worst effect of the code requirements now is the mis-application of resources it causes. Whether incentive licensing is or was ever a good idea or not, I think it's clear it does work as an incentive. People who otherwise would never have spent time acquiring and improving their Morse skills are doing so. Since most people have only a limited amount of time and energy to put into a hobby, by rewarding people for studying code, we're penalizing them for spending time doing other things -- experimenting with new modes, setting up high speed/high reliability networks, etc. I think the hobby would be better off if hams spent more time on those other things and less time on practicing code.

A message here seems to be that those of us who favor the de-emphasis of code should be spending our time attempting to convince other hams, and in getting new hams in through the no-code paths, not in petitioning the FCC.

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: 18 May 94 18:41:17 GMT

From: darwin.sura.net!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!csn!tali.hsc.colorado.edu!mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@seismo.css.gov

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994May17.140429.13105@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <2rb72p\$9hb@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <1994May18.100515.18323@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>u

Subject : Re: Code test speeds

The same arguments you give against advance classes of ham license apply equally to advanced college degrees, just as arguments made for irrelevant course requirements in college apply equally to the code requirement in ham radio. A PhD is fully as meaningless as you claim the Extra to be. There are no true requirements for advanced degrees to do things in the real world, either. If you support one, you must support the other in order to be consistent.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
To Sarah Brady, Howard Metzenbaum, Dianne Feinstein, and Charles Schumer:
Thanks. Without you, I would be neither a gun owner nor an NRA life member.

Date: 18 May 94 10:05:15 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@ucbvax.berkeley.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <xY+01K0.ndfriedman@delphi.com>,

<1994May17.140429.13105@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <2rb72p\$9hb@nyx10.cs.du.edu>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <2rb72p\$9hb@nyx10.cs.du.edu> jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>In article <1994May17.140429.13105@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
>Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:
>>Just as
>>we abhor different entrance requirements to college for blacks and whites,
>>or different hiring criteria for men and women, we should abhor a caste
>>system in amateur radio. There need only be *one* class of amateur, those
>>willing and able to engage in a lifelong pursuit of learning about radio
>>communications.
>
>So, are you willing to do away with master's and doctorate degrees, too? After
>all, they're the same thing: more recognition, and more privileges, for
>passing more tests.

Are master's and doctorates *entrance* requirements to a learning environment?
I suspect they are, but most of those receiving them aren't immediately
aware of that. Be that as it may, there's no value to amateur radio having
government sanctioned graduate degrees unless there's some particular reason
a higher standard must be adhered to in order to do certain things. Since
the Extra gets to do no extra things that any other licensee could not do
on a different frequency, except be a VE for high speed Morse exams, and be
the trustee for a space station (a requirement regularly waived by the FCC)
there's no real reason for the Extra exam (or for that matter the Advanced
exam). The only real difference between an Extra or Advanced licensee and
a General licensee is the arbitrary segregation of HF spectrum. Since the
General does the same things on the spectrum where he is allowed as the
Extra or Advanced does on his exclusive spectrum, this is simple segregation
for no reason other than artificial measures of status.

The courts have ruled that access to education or jobs must be judged
on criteria relevant to the tasks at hand, not on arbitrary criteria.
Since there is no modulation method or mode the General is prohibited
from doing that the Extra or Advanced is allowed to do, the segregation
by frequency is purely arbitrary and unsupportable.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #212
